DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 614 EC 162 866

AUTHOR Zabel, Robert H.; And Others
TITLE Relationships between Job Conditions and Characteristics and the Professional Satisfaction of Special Education Teacher Educators.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (62nd, Washington, DC, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Special Education; Surveys; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

The way in which special education teacher trainers view their profession and the relationships between job satisfaction and certain personal characteristics and job related conditions were examined. Questionnaires were completed by 622 special education teacher educators. The questionnaire consisted of two major components--questions pertaining to personal, professional background, and demographic information; and items reflecting job satisifaction. Program variables found to relate to job satisfaction were categorical/noncategorical type of program, degree emphasis, number of students, urban/suburban/rural location, social/community conditions, and geographic location. Personal variables investigated were--age, sex, and marital status; rank, tenure, and salary; and experience in higher education and years in present position. Job satisfaction was found to be influenced by both job conditions and personal characteristics. Among results was that salary was the only varialbe to significantly influence ratings on all five job satisfaction factors. Tables with factors relating to job satisfaction are included (SW)

Relationships Between Job Conditions and Characteristics and the Professional Satisfaction of Special Education Teacher Educators

Robert H. Zabel Ph.D.
Kansas State University

Warren J. White, Ph.D.
Kansas State University

Marilyn L. Smith, Ph.D.
~~Chattanooga Public Schools~~

Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children 62nd Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., 1984. Parts of this manuscript were taken from previously published or unpublished manuscripts by the authors.

Relationships Between Job Conditions and Characteristics and the Professional Satisfaction of Special Education Teacher Educators.

In recent years, questions about the conditions and quality of public education, and teacher education have emerged in the public and professional consciousness. At the same time, job-related stress and burnout have become major issues in the human services professions. Special educators have been particularly concerned with the inter-related issues of job satisfaction, burnout, and attrition among teachers (e.g., Bensky, et al., 1980; Lawrenson and McKinnon, 1982; Weiskopf, 1980). The rapid growth of special education during the 1970's has resulted in teacher shortages in some instructional specialties, and these shortages have further focused attention on these concerns.

Little attention, however, has been given to job satisfaction among teacher educators in the field. During the 1970's, university personnel participated in tremendous growth and expansion of programs in the midst of existing teacher shortages. Today, economic and political support for higher education at the state and federal levels is precarious at best (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1983). Less professional mobility, larger numbers of trained special education faculty, and maintenance rather than expansion of teacher education programs appear to be the status quo. Job-related stress and professional dissatisfaction among special education faculty may be greater than ever before.

Given this situation, the authors believed it to be an appropriate time to examine how special education teacher trainers view their profession and to determine what relationships may exist between job satisfaction and certain personal characteristics and job-related conditions of this population. To do

this, a large sample of special education teacher educators was surveyed during the spring and summer of 1982. A preliminary report of the study presented demographic information on these teacher educators and descriptive data concerning relationships between some program and personal characteristics of subjects and their job satisfaction (White, Zabel, and Smith, 1983). In a subsequent paper, relationships between job satisfaction and several program characteristics have been analyzed and discussed (Smith, White & Zabel, 1984). This paper summarizes the content of these two previous articles as well as analyses of relationships between their ratings of satisfaction with five job-related factors.

Procedures

Sample

A questionnaire was sent to 1345 members of the Teacher Education Division (TED) of the Council for Exceptional Children. The authors selected the TED membership as the most representative sample of special education teacher educators available. One mailing of questionnaires and one follow-up to nonrespondents were completed in the spring and summer of 1982. Respondents indicating they were not teacher educators were not included in the final sample. Canadian TED members were included in the initial mailing, but due to problems encountered with international postage, the Canadian responses also were deleted from the sample. After deletion of non-teacher educators and the few Canadian responses, the 622 completed questionnaires constituted a return rate of 60%.

Respondents ranged in age from 24 to 74, with a mean age of 43.2 (standard deviation = 9.41). Their mean number of years of teaching experience in regular education was 3.21 (s.d. = 4.43; mean = 2.0). One-third

had no regular classroom experience, and the other two-thirds reported a range of one to 30 years of regular classroom teaching. Their years of experience in special education classroom teaching ranged from zero to 41 years, with a mean of 5.12 years (s.d. = 5.17). Non-teaching public school experience (in positions such as school psychology or administration) ranged from zero to 32 years, with a mean of 4.13 years (s.d. = 5.23). Subjects averaged 8.76 years of experience in higher education, ranging from less than one year to 33 years (s.d. = 5.97), and had been in their present positions for 6.73 years on the average (s.d. = 5.47). Half of the respondents had begun their higher education careers prior to 1973.

Of the 618 respondents who indicated their sex, 358 (or 57.9%) were female, and 260 (or 42.1%) were male. Across the entire sample, 57.5% were married, 19.4% were single, 13.5% were divorced and single, and 9.4% had been divorced and remarried.

Most respondents (80%) had either a Ph.D. or an Ed. D. degree. Another 15.2% had master's degrees, 4.4% had Education Specialist (Ed. S.) degrees, and 0.5% had only bachelor's degrees. Special education was the major field in which the highest degree was earned for 74% of the respondents. Other major degree fields were educational psychology (7.4%) and curriculum and instruction (4.2%), with all other fields accounting for 14.4%.

The sample was represented largely by teacher educators at the assistant (30.5%), associate (25.8%), and full (26.2%) professor ranks. Only 9% were instructors, and another 8.4% indicated a status of "other." Slightly more than half (51.9%) reported that they had tenure at their institutions; 28.2% did not have tenure but were on tenure tracks; and 19.9% were not in tenure track positions.

The largest proportion (44.9%) earned between $20,000 and $30,000 per year, although 26.6% earned less than $20,000, and 28.4% earned more than $30,000. A calculated estimate of mean annual salary for the entire sample was about $25,400. However, some salaries reported at less than $15,000 probably do not represent full-time employment. The mean salary of respondents, exclusive of those at the "instructor" or "other" ranks, was about $27,200.

In response to a question about the nature of their college of university location, 47.3% of the respondents said they were in urban areas, 30.9% were in rural areas, and 21.8% were in suburban locations. As shown in Figure 1, respondents were distributed across all regions of the United States, but larger proportions were from more heavily populated areas such as the Northern Great Lakes (20.1%) than more sparsely populated areas like the Northern Plains (2.8%).

Smaller colleges and universities were well represented in the sample. Approximately 16% of respondents worked for schools with fewer than 2,500 students, and nearly half (47.7%) worked at institutions with fewer than 10,000 students. Only 26.6% worked at schools with more than 20,000 students.

More than half the sample (53.8%) said that their program was part of a special education department. Another 39.4% were assigned to a subdivision of another department, such as education or educational foundations: 4.3% had no departmental affiliation within a college or school of education, and 2.5% were in some "other" arrangement.

Respondents' programs placed emphasis on training at the various degree levels as follows: bachelor's only 15.1%; master's only = 12.5%; bachelors and master's = 39%; doctoral only, 1.2%; master's and doctoral = 9.9%; all three levels = 22.4%.

Subjects were almost evenly divided between categorical programs (49.5%) and cross-categorical or generic programs (50.5%).

Most programs were reported to offer the majority of their coursework on campus. In fact, only 3.5% of respondents reported that more than half of their course offerings were off-campus, while 84.7% offered less than one-fourth off campus. The percentages of respondents' own teaching responsibilities on and off campus followed a similar pattern.

Respondents were asked to indicate their teaching loads in number of semester hours or quarter hours that they typically taught. Most (83.5%) were on a semester system. Their mean teaching load was 9.95 semester hours (s.d. = 4.14). The 16.5% of respondents on a quarter system had average loads of 10.8 hours (s.d. = 5.46) each quarter. Respondents advised students at the bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral levels. For undergraduate advisors (N = 338), the mean number of undergraduate advisees was 34.6. The mean number of advisees for the 366 master's advisors was 30.8. At the doctoral level, 138 advisors had a mean of 5.5 advisees.

When asked to select the area that best described their primary job responsibilities, the overwhelming response was "teaching" (78%), followed by "administration" (13.8), "research" (2.3%), "service" (0.8%), and "other" (5.1%) activities.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two major components. First, recipients were asked questions pertaining to personal, professional background, and demographic information. The format for these items was either multiple-choice or fill-in-the-blank, depending on the nature of each question. Second, there were 29 items which the authors believe might reflect

job satisfaction. These items were grouped in the categories of social/community conditions, department/program conditions, job-related circumstances, and professional opportunities. Recipients of the questionnaires were asked to rate their satisfaction with each item using a Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = very dissatisfied; 5 = very satisfied).

Analyses

A principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted on the data from the 29 job satisfaction items as a means of data reduction. Five discrete factors resulted from this analysis. Table 1 presents the factor groupings which were used for further data analyses. Using a factor loading of .50 as a minimum criterion for inclusion, only four of the 29 items did not load on any of the five factors (required travel, clarity of job expectations, your qualifications, your qualifications for your current position, and climate). The resulting factors were labeled Social/Community Conditions, Advancement Opportunities, Program Quality, Financial Conditions, and Departmental Resources.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to control for the inflated experiment-wise error rate that would result from computing thirty one-way analyses of variance. For each significant MANOVA, ($p < .05$) univariate analyses of variance were completed to determine which of the satisfaction factors were significantly related to program and personal variables. Newman Keuls post-hoc comparisons were conducted when overall comparisons were significant ($p < .05$). Results are presented first for comparison of job satisfaction ratings according to several program variables and then according to selected personal variables.

Results

Program Variables

Categorical/Noncategorical. Significant differences between subjects in categorical or noncategorical teacher education programs were found for four of the five job satisfaction factors: Advancement Opportunities, $F(1,537) = 9.510$, $p = .002$; Department Quality, $F(1,553) = 7.029$, $p = .008$; Financial Conditions, $F(1,529) = 6.857$, $p = .009$; Departmental Resources, $F(1,516) = 8.385$, $p = .004$. In each case, faculty working in noncategorical programs were significantly more satisfied than faculty from categorical programs. There was, however, no significant difference between the categorical and noncategorical faculty on satisfaction with their Social/Community Conditions.

Degree Emphasis - Degree emphasis (BA/BS, MA/MS, Bachelor's and Master's combined, Master's and Doctorate combined, and all three levels) was significantly related to faculty job satisfaction with Social/Community Conditions, $F(1,503) = 5.051$, $p = .001$; Advancement Opportunities, $F(1,537) = 7.412$, $p = .001$; and Financial Conditions, $F(1,529) = 3.689$, $p = .006$. However, no significant differences existed for Department Quality and Department Resources. Several multiple comparison tests were found to be significant and are reviewed below.

Faculty whose programs offered Master's ($N = 53$, $X = 29.19$) as well as Doctoral ($N = 53$, $X = 29.19$) degrees were significantly more satisfied with their Social/Community Conditions than Bachelor's only degree programs ($N = 82$, $X = 25.28$) and Bachelor's combined with Master's level degree programs ($N = 198$, $X = 26.05$). Similar results were apparent for Advancement Opportunities. Faculty from programs offering both Master's and Doctoral degrees ($N = 57$, $X = 16.00$) and all three levels ($N = 125$, $X = 15.34$) were

more satisfied with their opportunities for advancement than faculty offering the following three degree levels: Bachelor's degree only (N = 78, X = 15.86), both Bachelor's and Master's degrees (N = 220, X = 16.31), and Master's degree only (N = 67, X = 16.76). Faculty from programs offering all three degree levels (N = 123, X = 14.97) and programs with only a Master's degree (N = 69, X = 14.77) were significantly more satisfied with Financial Conditions than faculty from programs offering only a Bachelor's degree (N = 76, X = 13.20).

Number of Students. Number of students enrolled at the college/university was found to be significantly related to four of the factors: Social/Community Conditions, $F(8,501) = 4.621$, $p < .001$; Advancement Opportunities, $F(8,530) = 5.404$, $p < .001$; Financial Conditions, $F(8,527) = 3.333$, $p = .001$; and Departmental Resources, $F(8,513) = 2.896$, $p = .004$. No significant differences were found for Department Quality.

Faculty at institutions with more than 35,001 students (N = 40, X = 30.85) were significantly more satisfied with Social/Community Conditions than faculty at schools with 2,500 or less (N = 84, X = 25.37), 5,001 to 10,000 (N = 103, X = 25.53), 15,001 to 20,000 (N = 51, X = 25.80), and 2,501 to 5.000 (N = 52, X = 26.14) students. The greatest variance in satisfaction ratings occurred among faculty whose student population was 15,001 to 20,000 (SD = 6.99); whereas, the least amount of variance was found in schools with 35,001 or more students (SD = 2.86). Variance for the other variables was relatively similar (range = 4.75 to 5.97). One exception to this trend appeared in responses from faculty at institutions of 15,001 to 20,000 students. These faculty tended to be among the more dissatisfied. Overall, however, the data suggested that faculty from larger institutions were more satisfied with Social/Community Conditions.

There was also significantly more satisfaction with opportunities for advancement among faculty from schools whose population was 35,001 or more students (N = 39, X = 19.44), 20,001-25,000 students (N = 54, X = 18.93), and 30,001 to 35,000 students (N = 30, X = 18.67) than among faculty from schools with either 2,500 or less students (N = 80, X = 15.49), and 15,001 to 20,000 students (N = 60, X = 15.77). In addition, faculty at institutions with a student body of 35,001 or more students and 20,001 to 25,000 students were more satisfied with their opportunities for advancement than those from schools with only 5,001 to 10,000 students (N = 115, X = 16.35). Again, with the exception of institutions with 15,001 to 20,000 students and 25,001 to 30,000 students (N = 20, X = 16.85), the data indicated that faculty in larger institutions were more satisfied with their Advancement Opportunities than those from smaller institutions.

Satisfaction with financial conditions also was significantly related to number of students. Faculty from schools with a student size of 35,001 or more (N = 38, X = 15.95) and 20,001 to 25,000 (N = 52, X = 15.54) were significantly more satisfied with Financial Conditions than faculty from schools with 15,001 to 20,000 students (N = 63, X = 13.02). Faculty from schools with over 35,000 students also were significantly more satisfied with financial conditions than faculty from schools with less than 2,500 students (N = 77, X = 13.78).

Number of students was significantly related to satisfaction with departmental resources. Faculty from schools whose student size was 35,001 or more (N = 40, X = 11.35), 20,001 to 25,000 (N = 52, X = 10.98), 10,001 to 15,000 (N = 81, X = 10.51), and 2,500 or less (N = 78, X = 10.38) were significantly more satisfied with departmental resources than faculty from schools whose student population was 15,001 to 20,000 (N = 56, X = 8.91).

There was no apparent trend in favor of larger institutions. In fact, faculty from schools whose student size was 15,001 to 20,000 and 25,001 to 30,000 (N = 22, X = 9.59) were least satisfied with Departmental Resources.

Urban/Rural/Suburban. Whether faculty indicated that their college/university was in an urban, suburban, or rural location was significantly related to Social/Community Conditions, $F(2,505) = 10,266$, $p < .001$ and Advancement Opportunities, $F(2,539) = 4.294$, $p = .014$. Financial Conditions, $F(2,533) = 2.979$, $p = .052$, approached significance, but no significant differences were evident for Department Quality and Departmental Resources.

Social/Community Conditions. Faculty from colleges/universities in suburban (N = 105, X = 27.77) and urban (N = 248, X = 27.21) locations were significantly more satisfied with Social/Community Conditions than faculty from rural (N = 155, X = 24.97) locations. In addition, faculty from urban (N = 259, X = 17.42) locations were significantly more satisfied with Advancement Opportunities than faculty from rural (N = 168, X = 16.11) locations. Although this relationship only approached significance, a similar trend was apparent with faculty from suburban (N = 116, X = 14.84) areas where more satisfaction with Financial Conditions was evident than from rural (N = 167, X = 13.81) areas.

Geographic Location. Geographic location was significantly related to Social/Community Conditions, $F(9,511) = 2.428$, $p = .010$, and Financial Conditions, $F(9,534) = 2.529$, $p = .008$, while no differences were observed for the other three factors. Ten geographic locations were chosen as variables. Five of the locations were significantly related to job satisfaction factors in multiple comparison tests: Mid Atlantic (District of Columbia, MD, DE, NJ, PA); Western Pacific (CA, OR, WA, AK, HI); Midwest (MD,

KS, IA, NE); Northern Great Lakes (OH, IN, MI, IL, WI, MN); and Northwestern Plains (SD, ND, WY, MT, CO).

Faculty from the Western Pacific (N = 44, X = 28.64) were significantly more satisfied with Social/Community Conditions than faculty from the Northwestern Plains (N = 16, X = 22.63). In contrast, faculty from the Mid Atlantic (N = 49, X = 16.25) were significantly more satisfied with financial conditions than faculty from Western Pacific (N = 42, X = 13.43), Midwest (N = 47, X = 13.72), and Northern Great Lakes (N = 110, X = 13.77). Thus, faculty from the Western Pacific were least satisfied with financial conditions and most satisfied with Social/Community Conditions.

Personal Variables

Age, Sex and Marital Status. Subjects were grouped into six age ranges (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, and 70 years of age and older). Sex options were male or female, and there were four marital status choices (single, married, divorced/single, and divorced/remarried). Table 2 contains a breakdown of the job satisfaction ratings by age, sex, and marital status of respondents.

Among the six age ranges of respondents, no differences were found for satisfaction with Social/Community Conditions. There were also no differences according to sex. However, significant differences were found for marital status (F=3.926, p=.0086), with both married and single faculty more satisfied with their Social/Community Conditions than divorced/single subjects.

Significant differences in respondents' ratings of their opportunities for professional advancement were found for age (F=3.051, p=.01), sex (F=17,161, p=.0000), and marital status (F=6.041, p=.0005). Males were more satisfied than females with their opportunities for advancement, and the post hoc analysis indicated that both single and married subjects were more

satisfied than either divorced/single or divorced/remarried subjects. However, the Student-Newman-Keuls Test did not reveal significant differences between any two age groups.

Although no differences in ratings of program quality were found according to respondents' sex or marital status, there was a significant difference according to age (F=3.182, p=.0077). However, no two age groups differed significantly. Satisfaction with Financial Conditions also differed according to all three variables: age (F=7.759, p=0000); sex (F=49.892, p=0000); and marital status F=3.279, p=.0207). Males were more satisfied than females, subjects between the ages of 40-49, 50-59, and 60-69 years of age were more satisfied than those 20-29 years of age, and married respondents were more satisfied than single respondents.

A significant difference in satisfaction with Departmental Resources was also found according to age of respondents (F=2.245, p=.0487). However, there were no significant differences between any two age groups. The difference between males' and females' ratings approached significsnce (F=3.621, p=.0576), but there was no difference for marital status.

Rank, Tenure, and Salary. Respondents' ratings of the five job satisfaction factors were also analyzed according to their academic rank (assistant, associate, and full professors), tenure status (tenured, non-tenured/tenure track, and non-tenure track), and annual salary ($10,000-$15,000, $15,001-$20,000, $20,001-$25,000, $25,001-$30,000, $30,001-$35,000, $35,000-$40,000, and more than $40,000). Respondents who had indicated their rank as "instructor" or whose annual salaries were less than $10,000 were not included in these analyses on the assumption that they might not be full-time faculty. (See Table 3.)

Although subjects' satisfaction with Social and Community Conditions did

not differ according to their academic rank, a significant difference was found for tenure (F=3.694, p=.0255), with tenured faculty more satisfied than non-tenured/tenure track faculty. There was also a significant difference according to salary range (F=4.547, p=.0002), although the post hoc analysis did not reveal differences between any two salary ranges.

A significant difference in subjects' ratings of their satisfaction with opportunities for advancement was found for all three variables: rank (F=14.064, p=.000); tenure (F=9.911, p=.0001); salary (F=7.872, p=000). Full professors were more satisfied than either assistants or associates. Both tenured and non-tenure track faculty were more satisfied than those in tenure track positions, but not presently tenured. Faculty in each salary range above $25,000 per year were more satisfied with their opportunities for advancement than those earning between $15,000 and $25,000. Not surprisingly, faculty earning more than $40,000 were more satisfied with their opportunities than those earning only $10,000 to $15,000 per year.

There were no significant differences in the ratings of the overall quality of respondents' programs according to either rank or tenure. There was, however, a difference according to salary (F=2.265, p=.0362), but the only pairwise difference between income groups was found between those earning above $40,000 and those in the $20,001-$25,000 range.

Significant differences in respondents' ratings of satisfaction with their programs' Financial Conditions were obtained for all three status variables: rank (F=66.814, p=.0000); tenure (F=38.367, p=0000), and salary (F=64.985, p=.0000). Full professors were more satisfied than associate professors, who were, in turn, more satisfied than assistant professors. Tenured faculty were more satisfied than non-tenured/tenure track faculty, and the latter were more satisfied than non-tenure track faculty. Ratings of

Financial Conditions by subjects in each salary group differed from those of each other salary group. The trend of the data was linear--the higher the salary, the greater the satisfaction with financial conditions.

Subjects' ratings of their Departmental Resources were found to differ according to academic rank (F=4.635, p=.0102), with full professors significantly more satisfied than associate professors. There was also a significant difference according to salary (F=2.945, p=.0078), although no pair-wise differences were found. There was no difference according to tenure status.

Experience in Higher Education and Years in Present Position. Table 4 contains a summary of ratings of the five satisfaction factors according to respondents' number of years in higher education and number of years in their present position. For both variables, the following five ranges were used: 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and more than 20 years.

A significant difference among ratings of satisfaction with Social and Community Condition was found for number of years in higher education (F=2.760, p=.0272), although no differences between any two groups were found. There also was no difference according to length of time in present position.

Ratings of opportunities for professional advancement were significantly related both to number of years in higher education (F=4.22, p=.0023) and number of years in present position (F=2.482, p=.0442). Post hoc analyses indicated that subjects with 1-5 years in their present positions were significantly less satisfied with their opportunities for advancement than those with either 6-10 or more than 20 years in their present positions.

Subjects' ratings of the quality of their programs differed according to both number of years they had been in higher education (F=3.012, p=.0178) and number of years in their present position (F=2.607, p=.0360). Those in their

current positions for more than 20 years rated their programs more favorably than did those with only 1-5 years in their jobs.

There were significant differences among subjects' ratings of satisfaction with their program's Financial Conditions both according to number of years in higher education ($F=24.077$, $p=.0000$) and number of years in present position ($F=5.193$, $p=.0005$). Faculty with only 1-5 years experience in higher education were less satisfied than those in each group with more experience, and those with 6-10 years were also less satisfied than those in each group with more experience. Respondents who had been in their present positions only 1-5 years were less satisfied than those in each other group with the exception of those who had been in their positions 16-20. The latter group also was significantly less satisfied with Financial Conditions than the group with the most experience (more than 20 years) in their positions.

No significant difference was found among ratings of Departmental Resources according to number of years in higher education. However, number of years in present position was found to be significant ($F=2.600$, $p=.0366$). The group with more than 20 years experience in their jobs rated their satisfaction with Departmental Resources significantly higher than did the least experienced group (1-5 years).

Discussion

This study would support the view that job satisfaction among special education teacher educators is multifaceted. It appears that it can be measured as several distinct factors, and that it is influenced both by the job conditions and personal characteristics. The involvement of both what individuals bring to their jobs as well as the nature of the jobs, themselves, is consistent with a recently proposed model of occupational stress and burnout (Zabel, Boomer, & King, in print).

Interpretation of the results of the program variable analyses are made difficult for several reasons. First, many of these variables are unique to the field of special education which does not allow for comparisons with other disciplines (e.g., categorized vs. noncategorized). Second, the data collected for this study does not eliminate various competing explanations for some of the results. For now, these data may be most useful in providing an initial descriptive data base against which future data may be compared and interpreted.

On the other hand, for some of the personal characteristics (e.g., age, sex, marital status) interpretations are more readily apparent. The following discussion examines some of these variables.

Although significant main effect differences were obtained with respect to age on all factors but Social/Community Conditions, only for Financial Conditions were differences between any two age groups evident. Here the results are not surprising, since the youngest group, which would be expected to have the lowest average salary, was less satisfied with their financial straits than each of the groups above 40 years of age. They were not, however, less satisfied than those in the age group immediately above themselves, whose salaries would be expected to be closest to their own. Nor

were they less satisfied than those above age 70, many of whom would be semi-retired.

It is notable that the ratings of the 30-39 age group consistently ranked low on the satisfaction ratings--lowest on three of the five factors and near the bottom on the other two. In fact, if the two relatively small (the youngest and oldest groups) were excluded from the analysis, subjects in this age range would have the lowest ranking mean ratings on all five factors. This pattern may reflect some of the pressures on faculty in the 30-39 age range to establish themselves in their careers, including the acquisition of tenure and promotion.

The analysis of job satisfaction according to sex revealed clear differences between males and females in their satisfaction with Advancement Opportunities, Financial Conditions, and Departmental Resources. When viewed in the context of additional descriptive information about academic rank and salary of males and females, there may be good reason for the differences. For example, although both sexes were almost evenly represented at the associate professor rank, there were substantial discrepancies at lower and higher ranks. Only 2.3 percent of the males compared to 13.9 percent of the females were instructors, and 21.6 percent of the former were assistant professors compared to 37.3 percent of the latter. However, more than three times as many males (43.6 percent) as females (13.1 percent) were full professors.

Striking discrepancies were also evident in male and female salaries. The calculated estimate of mean annual salary reported by female respondents was only $22,300, compared to $29,600 for males. Thus, males were paid 30% more than females. Disparities in salaries of males and females in higher education are not unique to special education, but appear to occur across

discipline and type of institution (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1983).

Although these differences in academic rank and salary would appear to reflect institutional discrimination against females, there are other factors that could also account for some of the difference. For example, males in the sample were older than females (44.5 and 42.2 years, respectively) and they had more years of related professional experience than females (18.1 and 14.5 years, respectively). Males had begun their careers in higher education 3.5 years before females and had been in their present positions longer (8.1 and 5.7 years, respectively). Also, about 30 percent more males (92.4 percent) than females (71.1 percent) had doctorates. Possession of this terminal degree would affect initial salary, and it is typically required for advancement in academic rank. It also appears that some of the lower salaries in this sample were paid to the larger proportion of women who were at the instructor rank and in part-time positions.

Nevertheless, one of the most striking results of this study is the difference in job satisfaction between males and females. Some of the difference may be due to real differences in job conditions such as salary and rank. Another intriguing line of inquiry not addressed in this study would be the investigation of possible differences in personality types, professional expectations, and reward systems between male and female special education faculty. Until recently, education has been one of the few professions relatively open to females, while males have had access to a wide range of professional careers. Because of their greater professional options, it may, in effect, be more likely that males have selected academic careers to meet certain expectations for professional satisfaction, while many women may have entered the field primarily because it is one of the few professions that offers them professional opportunity.

With 42.3 percent of the sample in the single, divorced/single, and divorced/remarried categories, the analysis of relationships of marital status and ratings of job satisfaction is compelling. Not surprisingly, marital status did not affect respondents' satisfaction with either Program Quality or Departmental Resources. However, there were significant differences in assessments of Social/Community Conditions, Advancement Opportunities, and Financial Conditions, with "married" (divorced/remarried were not included in this group) respondents expressing the greatest satisfaction. The degree to which the relative dissatisfaction of the other groups reflects discrimination toward those in less traditional marital roles or the additional economic and emotional burdens on those who are not "married" is unclear from this analysis, but worthy of further investigation.

It is apparent from the descriptive data (White, Zabel & Smith, 1983) that females are less likely to be married than their male colleagues. More than twice as many females (43 percent) as males (19.1 percent) were not "married", and a greater percentage of divorced males (11.9 percent) than females (7.9 percent) had remarried. Academic rank was also related to marital status, with about two-thirds (68.3 percent) of the full professors, 55.6 percent of the associate professors, and just over one-half (51.3 percent) of assistant professors in the "married" category. While it would be predicted that a higher proportion of the younger, assistant professors would be single, it might also be expected that older, full professors would have had greater opportunity to become divorced or divorced/remarried. The latter was not the case. Rather, larger numbers of lower ranking respondents fell into these categories.

These patterns probably reflect changes in culturally acceptable life-styles, especially for women, in the last 10-20 years. The data suggest

that such movement toward more independent life-styles may also be accompanied by the perception of greater financial burden, less opportunity for professional advancement, and less satisfying social relationships.

Academic rank did not appear to affect satisfaction with either Social/Community Conditions or Program Quality, yet it was related to ratings of Advancement Opportunities, Financial Conditions, and Department Resources. Not surprisingly, full professors, who have successfully advanced in rank, were the most satisfied group. Although no one appears to be getting rich on university salaries (the calculated mean annual salary for the sample was only $25,400), salary was clearly related to rank. Only 17.1 percent of the assistant professors earned more than $25,000, compared to 55.5 percent of associate professors and 75.7 percent of full professors. Also, because of their success at understanding the institutional systems in which they work, as evidenced by their high rank, full professors may have been able to find the departmental resources to meet their needs or have reconciled themselves to the absence of those resources.

Acquisition of tenure typically requires that a person spend a specified number of years at an institution. Thus, it would be expected that tenured faculty would be more satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Advancement Opportunities, Program Quality, and even Social/Community Conditions. That is, the former group has advanced, and they must be sufficiently satisfied with their programs and community environment to have stayed long enough to acquire tenure.

It is somewhat surprising that faculty in non-tenure track, or "soft money", positions report greater satisfaction with their opportunities for advancement than non-tenured, tenure track faculty. This finding may be evidence of the pressures on the latter to earn tenure, on the one hand, and

the more circumscribed expectations for performance by the former group, on the other hand.

It is notable that salary was the only variable to significantly influence ratings on all five job satisfaction factors. In each instance, higher salary meant greater satisfaction. It appears that the boundary between relatively satisfied and dissatisfied respondents was at about $25,000, although those earning more than $40,000 per year constituted a distinct, and highly satisfied group.

Certainly, few faculty either enter higher education teaching careers, or continue in them, expecting to earn high salaries. Still, these data indicate that salary has a pervasive effect on job satisfaction. It may be that tangible rewards play a more influential role in job satisfaction as faculty salaries fall further behind those in other sectors of the economy, as predictions for the financial future of institutions of higher education are pessimistic, and as other sources of reinforcement, such as social status, diminish.

Although there were statistically significant differences according to number of years in higher education for all factors with the exception of Department Resources, the direction of these differences was not always apparent. However, the trend appears to be in the direction of those with more experience reporting greater professional satisfaction. This was clearly the case for number of years in present position, where the most experienced group was generally most satisfied and the least experienced group was least satisfied. An exception to this pattern involved those with 16-20 years in their present positions. They were significantly less satisfied with their financial straits than those with more than 20 years in their positions. It may be that some individuals in this experience range are facing additional

financial burdens, such as educational expenses of their children. However, the data are not available to conclusively explain this finding.

Taken together, these data on relationships between personal characteristics and ratings of job satisfaction could be used to provide profiles of the most and least professionally satisfied special educator. The former would be a married, male, full professor with tenure, over 40 years old, earning more than $40,000, who has been in higher education and in his present position for more than 20 years. The least professionally satisfied individual, on the other hand, would be an unmarried, female, non-tenured, assistant professor, under 40 years of age, earning less than $25,000 with less than 6 years in higher education and in her present position.

Because of existing data indicating similar patterns of salary and rank, for example, in other fields and the similarity of current financial conditions across a variety of disciplines in higher education, this research may have far reaching implications for universities. Based on data gathered in a recent nation-wide study of stress in academe, Gmelch, Wilke, and Lovrich (Reference note) have reported similar amounts of job-related stress across a diverse range of disciplines.

While the kinds of relationships between job satisfaction and personal characteristics of university faculty evident in this study are certainly not unique to special educators, it is the author's belief that special education faculty may be experiencing both greater stress and less professional satisfaction than faculty in some other disciplines as a result of the stressors mentioned at the outset of this paper.

Reference Note

Gmelch, W. H., Wilke, P. K., and Lovrich, N. Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983.

References

Bensky, J. M., Shaw, S. F., Gouse, A. S., Bate, S. H., Dixon, B., and Beane, W. E. (1980). Public Law 94-142 and stress: A problem for educators. Exceptional Children, 47. 24-29.

Men's and Women's 1982-83 salaries compared. (1983, 26 d(1), 26). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Fimian, M. J., and Santoro, T. M. (1983) Sources and manifestations of occupational stress as reported by full-time special education teachers. Exceptional Children, 49, 540-543.

Huntze, S. L. and Grosenick, J. K. (1980). National needs analysis in behavior disorders: Human resource issues in behavior disorders. Columbia, Missouri: Department of Special Education, University of Missouri - Columbia.

Lawrenson, G. M. and McKinnon, A. J. (1982). A survey of classroom teachers of the emotionally disturbed: Attrition and burnout factors. Behavioral Disorders. 8, 41-49.

Rummel, R. J. Applied factor analysis. (1970). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Smith, M., White, W. J., and Zabel, R. H. (1984). College/University program variables and their relationship to the job satisfaction of special education teacher educators. Teacher Education as a Special Education, 7, (1), 39-45.

Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 47, 18-23.

White, W. J., Zabel, R. H., and Smith, M. (1984). Job conditions and job satisfaction among teacher educators in special education. Counterpoint, 4 (1).

Zabel, R. H., Boomer, L. W., and King, T. R. (in print). A model of stress and burnout among behaviorally disordered students.

Zabel, R. H. and Zabel, M. K. (1980). Burnout: A critical issue for educators. Education Unlimited, 2, 23-25.

Zabel, R. H. and Zabel, M. K. (1981). Burnout: Part myth; part reality. Counterpoint, 13.

Zabel, R. H. and Zabel, M. K. (1982). Factors involved in burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 49, 261-263.

Table 1
Job Satisfaction Factors*

Factors	Items	Loading
1. Social/Community Conditions:	Shopping	.798
	Cultural activities	.793
	Social environment	.784
	Recreational activities	.680
	Housing	.653
	Schools	.624
	Transportation	.578
2. Advancement Opportunities:	Opportunities to pursue professional interests	.809
	Opportunities within institution for professional involvement	.718
	Time to pursue professional interests	.698
	Opportunities for professional advancement in field of special education	.630
	Professional resources available	.534
3. Program Quality:	Quality of your special education program	.835
	Qualifications of others in your department	.756
	Mission of department	.714
	Quality of students	.552
4. Financial Conditions:	Salary	.734
	Financial resources available	.602
	Financial support available for professional development	.598
	Assigned work load	.587
5. Department Resources:	Office facilities	.756
	Clerical assistance	.563
	Departmental facilities	.541

* The amount of variance accounted for within each of these factors is as follows: Factor 1 = 85.9%; Factor 2 = 66.3%; Factor 3 = 76.8%; Factor 4 = 48.6%; Factor 5 = 52.9%.

Table 2

Ratings of Job Satisfaction Factors
According to Age, Sex, and Marital Status

	Factors														
	Social/Community Conditions			Advancement Opportunities			Program Quality			Financial Conditions			Department Resources		
Variables	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Age															
20-29	18	27.28	6.43	19	18.68	4.55	20	16.50	1.76	16	12.19	3.17	19	11.63	2.43
30-39	206	25.96	5.50	211	16.08	4.54	220	14.88	3.00	204	13.37	3.48	202	9.93	2.97
40-49	164	26.92	5.57	175	17.68	4.49	173	15.86	3.29	169	15.12	3.62	169	10.57	2.78
50-59	109	27.38	6.13	110	16.93	4.54	121	15.79	2.98	122	14.92	3.53	114	10.18	3.09
60-69	28	26.54	6.36	29	17.28	4.87	30	15.77	3.36	31	15.61	3.16	27	10.30	3.34
70+	7	27.00	5.23	8	17.13	4.70	10	16.50	2.22	11	13.09	3.48	11	8.82	3.46
Sex															
Females	307	26.30	5.70	318	16.25	4.60	321	15.52	2.89	306	13.43	3.44	307	10.03	3.05
Males	223	27.13	5.76	240	17.85	4.40	250	15.48	3.35	243	15.53	3.49	231	10.52	2.83
Marital Status															
Married	305	27.18	5.64	319	17.35	4.39	324	15.63	3.07	315	14.73	3.64	303	10.49	2.93
Single	97	26.97	5.75	104	17.35	4.54	108	15.60	3.37	106	13.61	3.47	107	9.95	3.17
Div./Rem.	50	25.66	4.46	55	15.05	4.69	57	15.00	2.70	52	13.69	3.55	53	9.98	2.50
Div./Sing.	75	24.87	6.52	76	15.75	5.04	78	15.10	3.12	73	14.25	3.62	71	9.87	3.07

Table 3

Ratings of Job Satisfaction Factors
According to Academic Rank, Tenure, and Salary

	Factors														
	Social/Community Conditions			Advancement Opportunities			Department Quality			Financial Conditions			Department Resources		
Variables	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Academic Rank															
Assistant	161	25.81	5.44	176	15.80	4.45	177	15.27	2.92	172	12.99	3.18	161	10.06	2.82
Associate	134	26.96	5.34	143	16.52	4.56	149	15.30	3.10	144	14.04	3.07	146	9.67	2.98
Full	143	27.08	5.88	152	18.35	4.29	155	15.77	3.31	157	16.87	3.11	146	10.71	3.01
Tenure Status															
Tenured	274	27.19	5.56	290	17.50	4.38	298	15.75	3.05	291	15.51	3.42	284	10.27	3.07
Non-tenured	146	25.61	5.64	162	15.56	4.75	159	15.04	3.10	155	13.40	3.16	151	9.96	2.79
Non-tenure track	103	26.56	6.10	101	17.21	4.50	108	15.56	3.17	99	12.52	3.49	99	10.45	2.95
Salary Range															
$10,001-15,000	15	28.47	4.53	17	16.00	5.51	17	15.53	3.39	17	10.35	3.00	14	9.43	3.94
$15,001-20,000	94	25.46	5.86	99	15.67	4.43	99	15.68	2.74	89	11.94	2.95	90	10.16	2.80
$20,001-25,000	136	25.41	5.21	146	15.64	4.42	145	14.79	3.06	139	13.01	2.67	141	9.55	2.90
$25,001-30,000	100	28.42	5.26	107	17.63	4.31	110	15.43	3.18	114	14.96	2.65	104	10.54	2.91
$30,000-35,000	67	26.84	5.41	72	17.51	3.45	72	15.83	2.91	77	15.83	2.67	74	10.19	3.07
$35,000-40,000	35	26.77	6.89	38	18.50	5.23	39	15.82	3.84	39	17.13	2.86	34	10.41	3.31
$40,001 +	45	28.42	6.12	49	19.57	4.26	52	16.38	3.17	52	19.42	2.40	49	11.43	2.90

Table 4

Ratings of Job Satisfaction Factors
According to Number of Years in Higher Education
and in Present Position

	Factors														
	Social/Community Conditions			Advancement Opportunities			Department Quality			Financial Conditions			Department Resources		
Variables	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Years in Higher Education															
1-5	164	25.79	5.89	172	16.10	4.63	180	15.14	3.08	167	12.84	3.38	166	10.16	2.77
6-10	158	26.83	5.14	163	16.71	4.20	169	15.19	3.17	160	13.73	3.37	155	10.06	3.04
11-15	113	26.81	5.60	128	17.62	4.59	126	16.10	2.96	127	15.40	3.35	125	10.34	2.94
16-20	52	28.33	6.07	57	18.12	4.32	59	15.71	3.28	59	16.80	3.30	57	10.42	3.41
21 +	24	28.46	6.47	26	18.62	5.28	26	16.54	2.98	25	16.84	3.41	23	10.48	2.94
Years in Present Position															
1-5	54	25.09	6.95	56	14.80	4.73	60	14.58	2.87	52	11.90	3.42	52	9.02	2.49
6-10	75	25.83	6.29	82	16.93	4.80	80	15.00	3.68	76	13.61	3.86	77	10 22	3.03
11-15	49	26.55	5.26	51	16.27	4.72	55	15.16	2.60	53	14.04	3.59	53	10.21	3.05
16-20	42	26.86	4.72	43	15.93	4.72	44	15.61	3.08	46	13.07	2.89	48	10.31	2.74
21 +	38	26.08	5.29	43	17.44	4.45	43	16.47	2.94	42	15.07	3.68	40	10.80	2.76